DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 700 HE 000 533

Issues in University Governance. A Report to the Ford Foundation on the Summer Colloquium on University Governance.

Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Teachers College.
Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Sep 68
Note-55p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.85
Descriptors-Academic Freedom, Administrator Background, *Governance, *Higher Education, *Institutional Administration, Institutional Role, *Social Change, *Student Attitudes

The colloquium on issues in university governance was organized to identify and define major governmental issues facing US colleges and universities and, following an interdisciplinary analysis of the issues, to propose solutions or to determine next steps to be taken. Explanations that emerged as to why the governance of academic institutions has become an increasing source of debate were the inadequate adaptation of US college and university structures to social change, the loss of academic institutions' protective coat of isolation as they are drawn into the mainstream of US life, the drastic shift of the institutional balance of power, the loss of college students' bargaining power in influencing policies at their institutions, and the changes in US society and their influence on students of the late 1960's. It was also agreed that problems exist in university financing curricular planning, institutional efficiency, and the adjudicating of differences of opinion about institutional purposes and roles. Two serious problems must be resolved in order to lessen the conflict over governance: inadequate analysis of the problems of governance, and insufficient understanding or knowledge of the data that exist on these problems. The recommendations in the report focus on these two problems. Summaries of the general sessions of the colloquium are appended. (WM)

ED028700

ISSUES IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

A Report to the Ford Foundation on the Summer Colloquium on University Governance

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER AND ADULT EDUCATION
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

September, 1968

HE000 533

During the summer of 1968, the Ford Foundation supported three activities at Columbia University growing out of the spring disturbances: the work of the University's Faculty Executive Committee, the research of Students for a Restructured University, and a colloquium on issues in university governance organized by the Institute of Higher Education and the Department of Higher and Adult Education at Teachers College. The first two of these projects aimed specifically at helping resolve immediate problems at Columbia itself. The colloquium, on the other hand, was organized to identify the genesis of governmental problems facing American colleges and universities at large and to consider alternative solutions from an interdisciplinary perspective.

This report describes the organization and conclusions of the summer colloquium. At its first session, President John Fischer of Teachers College posited a high goal for the colloquium: "If an institution like Teachers College has any particular responsibility in the events that have shaken this university and other institutions, it is the responsibility to try and convert that experience into knowledge and this knowledge into wisdom." The members of the colloquium have tried to meet this goal and on their behalf and that of the Institute of Higher Education and the Department of Higher and Adult Education, I wish to thank the officers of the Ford Foundation for assisting us in undertaking this important and significant task.

Walter Sindlinger, Chairman
Department of Higher and Adult Education
Interim Director, Institute of Higher Education

CONTENTS

	Page
Background of the Colloquium	1
Organization of the Colloquium	3
Membership	3
Task Groups	4
General Sessions	5
Staff	8
Conclusions of the Colloquium	9
Recommendations	16
Summaries of the General Sessions	21

BACKGROUND OF THE COLLOQUIUM

Two years ago, a Commission of Inquiry, appointed by the Hebdomadal Council of Oxford University and chaired by Lord Franks, the Provost of Worcester College, concluded that the core of Oxford's problems was its inadequate management. "If the administration is reformed", the Commission concluded, "much can be done; if it is not, the University is likely to remain a chaos of ineffective good intentions." And with the succinct precision of English academic prose at its best, the Commission pointed to Oxford's great weakness:

> We are satisfied that, by heroic efforts, the machinery of Oxford has been made to move more quickly than it did twenty years ago; but it is a bizarre achievement to show great skill in avoiding obstacles of one's own creation.

During the past two years it has become evident that many American universities are also facing major problems of management and control. They, too -- with a few exceptions -- have been showing great skill in avoiding obstacles of their own creation; but the obstacles appear to be increasingly numerous and the skills of avoiding them seem increasingly fragile.

Until the episodes at Berkeley in 1964, the problems of American academic government seemed only sporadic and local, not cumulative and national. A case of academic freedom might erupt at one institution or a legislative wrangle might involve another, but in general an uneasy agreement about the nature of academic government was in effect among the major parties then involved: an agreement symbolized by the adoption of the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" in the past

several years by the AAUP, the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards. Until recently, the few issues attracting national attention were the influence of federal support on higher education, the attempts by the states to better systematize their public colleges and universities, the stirrings of laitization among a number of Catholic governing boards, and the steady expansion of the union movement among the professoriate.

Since then, however, the conventional wisdom of academic government has been brought into question -- particularly by students, who have joined the discussion of governmental issues as active participants. Questions of principle are now being raised afresh:

> Whose institutions are they, anyway? -- The students'? The faculties'? Their patrons' and donors'? Or society's at large?
>
> To whom are academic organizations accountable? Who should be their governors, and thus have a voice in determining their purposes and their role in American life?
>
> And how are the rights of legitimate interest groups in the university to be structured and assured?

To better understand these developments, Teachers College through its Institute of Higher Education and its Department of Higher and Adult Education inaugurated a colloquium on university governance at the beginning of the summer session. The purpose of the colloquium was to identify more specifically the governmental issues that universities in the United States now face and to bring to bear on these issues scholarship from relevant fields and the views of both specialists and students. In the

words of the proposal for the colloquium, its objectives were "to derive a better understanding of the forces presently at work in institutions of higher education, to accurately identify and define critical issues, and, when feasible, to propose solutions or to determine next steps to be taken in seeking solutions if further evidence is required."

The members of the Department and the Institute planned the colloquium as the first stage in their efforts to use their resources in new ways to meet the problems of American higher education. The colloquium thus offered the staff an opportunity to examine a major area of concern that will need their further attention in the coming years.

The purposes of the colloquium were implemented within a two-month period: the month of June was spent in planning -- utilizing the ideas of the faculty members, students, and administrative officers of both Teachers College and the University -- and the colloquium itself spanned the five weeks from July 9 to August 8. The success of these two months will be assessed after a brief summary of the organization of the colloquium.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLOQUIUM

Membership

Only those persons willing to commit themselves to a period of five weeks of intense work and study were encouraged to join the colloquium as members. Sixty-eight persons -- including university administrators,

professors, and graduate and undergraduate students -- agreed to meet these requirements. Nine of the students received academic credit for their studies in conjunction with the colloquium. Besides these regular members, students and administrators from Columbia and other institutions in New York and New Jersey attended open sessions when scholars or outside speakers were invited to address the Colloquium. These general sessions were publicized on campus through posters and Columbia's summer newspaper; and representatives from both the Faculty Executive Committee and Students for a Restructured University participated regularly in them.

Task Groups

Because of the breadth of the issues under consideration, the members of the colloquium agreed at an early meeting to spend part of their effort in small groups on particular issues. Four of these task groups were organized. Their topics and leaders were the following:

"The University and the Community"

John Connolly, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Higher and Adult Education, Teachers College
Maxine Greene, Professor of English, Teachers College, and Editor, Teachers College Record

"Roles of Various University Participants"

JB Lon Hefferlin, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College

"Views of Student Groups"

Thomas Leemon, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College

"The Reward System and How Decisions are Made"

Walter Garms, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College
Walter Sindlinger, Chairman, Department of Higher and Adult Education, Teachers College

The task groups determined their own schedule, usually meeting between once and twice a week. While each group attacked its own problem differently, all four attempted to accomplish three tasks: (1) identify and analyze the issues involved, (2) review the relevant literature and research, and (3) recommend further action or study. In their work, the groups sought the aid of additional resource persons, including Professor Theodore Caplow of the Department of Sociology at Columbia, Professor George Z.F. Bereday of Teachers College, and Mr. John Cooney of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs.

General Sessions

Open sessions of the colloquium were held on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons from July 9 to August 8. Because the colloquium was to undertake an interdisciplinary analysis of the issues of university governance, scholars from the fields of economics, history, law, psychology, political science, and education were invited to address these sessions. They were asked to speak from the point of view of their particular disciplines as well as to share with the members of the colloquium their personal interpretations of the problems of university government.

The speakers and panelists selected for the sessions were as follows:

Tuesday, July 9: "The Effects of Delocalism on Academic Freedom and Governance"

Speaker: Walter P. Metzger, Professor of History, Columbia University
Panel: Michael Brick, Associate Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College
Frederick Kershner, Professor of History, Teachers College
Gordon Darkenwald, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Higher and Adult Education, Teachers College
Elizabeth Norton, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Higher and Adult Education, Teachers College

Tuesday, July 16: "Questions Concerning the Issues"

Speaker: David Riesman, Henry Ford II Professor of the Social Sciences, Harvard University
Panel: Sloan Wayland, Associate Dean for Student Affairs, Teachers College
John Thoms, Chairman, Students for a Restructured University, Columbia University
Neal Hurwitz, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Political Science, Columbia University

Thursday, July 18: "The Student's Stake in Academic Governance"

Speaker: Franklin Littell, President, Iowa Wesleyan University
Panel: Philip Phenix, Professor of Philosophy and Education, Teachers College
George La Noue, Associate Professor of Government and Education, Teachers College

Tuesday, July 23: "The Necessity for the System to Overthrow Itself"

Speaker: Dr. Charles DeCarlo, Director of Automation Research, IBM
Panel: Francis A. J. Ianni, Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Division of Educational Institutions and Programs, Teachers College

Thursday, July 25: "Changing Concepts of Student Citizenship in the Contemporary University"

Speaker: Alan Westin, Professor of Public Law and Government, Columbia University
Panel: W. Max Wise, Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College
R. Freeman Butts, Associate Dean for International Studies, Teachers College
Steven Silberblatt, Undergraduate Student, Columbia University
Nigel Paneth, Undergraduate Student, Columbia University

Tuesday, July 30: "The Economics of Higher Education"

Speakers: Harold Noah, Associate Professor of Economics and Education, Teachers College
David Levey, Assistant Professor of Economics, Yale University
Panelist: Walter I. Garms, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College

Thursday, August 1: "The University and Due Process: A Somewhat Different View"

Speaker: Clark Byse, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, and President, American Association of University Professors
Panel: Maxine Greene, Professor of English, Teachers College, and Editor, Teachers College Record
JB Lon Hefferlin, Assistant Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College
David Ment, Staff Member, Faculty Executive Committee, Columbia University
Dale Mann, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Philosophy and the Social Sciences, Teachers College

Tuesday, August 6: "Academic Government: Participants and Structures"

Speaker: W. H. Cowley, David Jacks Professor of Higher Education, emeritus, Stanford University
Panel: W. Max Wise, Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College
Mary Mix, Instructor, Department of Philosophy and the Social Sciences, Teachers College

Thursday, August 8: "Politics and Student Power"

Speakers: Edward Schwartz, President, National Student Association
Carl Davidson, Regional Officer, Students for a Democratic Society
Panel: Matthew Miles, Professor of Psychology and Education, Teachers College
Mrs. Rusty Eisenberg, Project Director, University and Society, Columbia University
John Thoms, Chairman, Students for a Restructured University, Columbia University
Cary Wasserman, President, Graduate Faculties Student Council, Columbia University

To stimulate discussion, the open sessions employed three primary formats. With an individual speaker, the panel might informally respond to his presentation. These panels, drawn from students, faculty, and administrative ranks, raised questions for clarification and expressed divergent points of view. Second, two or three faculty members from disciplines

other than that of the speaker would formally comment on his presentation from the perspective of their own disciplines. And third, when two speakers addressed a session, each speaker raised questions with the other.

At each session, from one-half to one-third of the total time was allotted for general questions and discussion among the members and participants in the colloquium. These discussions were often so stimulating that most meetings ran into the dinner hour. Following the meetings, cocktails or dinner offered further opportunity for discussion between the speaker and selected colloquium participants.

The statements of the participants in the colloquium have begun to be edited for publication at a later date, but a summary of the presentations at the open sessions is included in this report beginning on page 21.

Staff

The colloquium was coordinated by Dr. Walter Sindlinger, Chairman of the Department of Higher and Adult Education and Interim Director of the Institute of Higher Education. William Summerscales, Administrative Associate to the Director of the Division of Educational Institutions and Programs and an Instructor in the Department of Higher and Adult Education, coordinated the speakers and panels and served as moderator during the general sessions.

A central office staff of four full-time research assistants -- Gordon Darkenwald, Ronald Getty, Cheryl Opacinch, and Ernest Sobel -- aided in preparing the work of the task groups, assembled a set of readings for the colloquium members, developed a resource library, and taped, edited, summarized, and drafted critiques of the presentations. These four research

assistants met twice a week to discuss the presentations and plan further activities arising from them. In addition, Miss Opacinch took responsibility for all financial arrangements and bookkeeping.

Two part-time research assistants, John Connolly and Neal Hurwitz, aided the task groups with physical arrangements, scheduling of resource persons, and drafting group reports. A full time secretary, supplemented with occasional part-time help, was responsible for transcribing the presentations and preparing documents for distribution.

This staff, together with Professors Garms, Greene, Hefferlin, and Leemon, who served as task-group leaders, met periodically to discuss the progress of the colloquium. After the final session on August 8, members of the staff met during the weeks of August 12 and 17 to prepare this final report, identify unresolved problems requiring further study, and formulate a general plan for activities during the 1968-69 year.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE COLLOQUIUM

Out of the colloquium sessions and the work of the task groups, several explanations emerged as to why the governance of academic institutions has become an increasing source of debate since the episodes at Berkeley in 1964. While students have sparked the reconsideration of conventional administrative and governmental practices, changes in these practices are being forced by changes in the role of higher education within American society and in the society itself. Among the developments that received particular attention during the colloquium as underlying the present difficulties were these:

1. The rush of social events has caught up with and outdistanced academic institutions, most of which have not adequately adapted their structures to their new conditions.

Several colloquium participants of a historical bent pointed out that American colleges and universities are structurally nineteenth-century institutions. Their present organization of faculties, departments, and academic procedures stems from the 1880's and 1890's when the American university was born. Their more recent institutional accretions, such as their variety of ancillary personnel ranging from guidance counselors to development officers, and their research institutes with project-oriented staffs, have not altered these academic arrangements of earlier decades. Our institutions thus lack models and theories of academic organization, of academic freedom, and of academic administration adequate for the late twentieth century.

For example, the phenomenal burgeoning of higher education since the Second World War has occurred primarily by haphazardly applying traditional institutional models to new situations -- more junior colleges, more and bigger departments, more of the same requirements -- rather than by devising organizational innovations to solve new needs. The natural growth pains of any rapidly expanding industry have hence been exacerbated by the frustrations of outmoded procedures, as the growth of unionism among professors and of alienation among students all too clearly demonstrate.

2. Colleges and universities have been drawn into the mainstream of American life and have lost their protective cloak of isolation.

Clark Byse notes that historically Americans have been less concerned with colleges and universities than they are worried today about children's summer camps: in the past, college was a preserve for the few and therefore inconsequential to the majority of the society. Who, indeed, would have wanted

to be a "non-student" at such an institution? But now the college has become a central institution in American life. As a major channel of entry into middle-class status, college attendance to many students and their parents seems no longer a privilege but a necessity -- and to some students, an annoying and irrelevant necessity at that.

The universities, at the same time, have expanded their functions and have come to serve unnumbered constituencies; and with each group's interest in their work, the potential conflicts of opinion about the universities' proper role have grown not arithmetically but geometrically. Dare the university serve as an agent of social reform -- or can it even avoid this role? Can it be a servant to all without being a slave to any?

As Don Price recalls about the young lady from Kent, "who knew what it meant/ when men took her to dine/ gave her cocktails and wine,/ she knew what it meant -- but she went," the universities have gone along with the process of increased involvement in political, industrial, and social life. In this process, they may not have lost as much supposed autonomy as some academics suspect, since they are now less subject to the whims of a capricious single patron than they once were because of their now broadened base of support. But this gain has been jeopardized by the restricted and short-term financing of many of their new activities. In particular, the project grant system championed by the federal government appears in retrospect to have been a Pandora's box now that some major universities are in serious financial straits because of their overdependence on it.

Moreover, while university professors have become individually powerful in social policy and social action, the universities have remained relatively powerless as organizations. Their new publics have naturally been interested in special projects, particular professors, and limited activities,

rather than the welfare of the institution at large. At the same time, many faculty members who have resisted these entrepreneurial pressures have tended to neglect institutional welfare for departmental concerns, since their departments, rather than the institution, have increasingly determined the rewards of academic life.

3. <u>The balance of power within colleges and universities has shifted drastically</u>.

Except at a few lingering institutions, the influence of the president has withered. Old-time autocracy and paternalism have disappeared. But the animus of professors towards the administrator remains: his role is despised and his tasks are denigrated, despite the fact that administration is no less important to the effectiveness of an academic institution than to that of any other organization.

As the administrator has declined in power, the professor has risen to the dominant position at major institutions. The faculty shortage of the last decade has boosted the individual professor's bargaining power enormously. As David Fellman points out, "He is quite free, if at all miffed by the officials of his institution, to pick up his punch cards and assistants and, together with his money, go elsewhere." Thus the academic associations -- the professors' scholarly associations, their protective organizations, and the several accrediting agencies that are dominated by educators -- have grown to major influence in professional life and curricular planning.

With this increase in faculty power, the ideal of "collegiality" and faculty democracy has come to fruition. Unfortunately, however, at some institutions this has not led to greater independence for teachers in

curricular development and innovation, but to stagnation, since the faculties at these institutions are requiring consensus on all curricular decisions. At these institutions, faculty democracy has been no improvement over administrative autocracy, since democracy is being abused by a majority unwilling to trust a minority of an individual professor to experiment within the curriculum.

4. The student has been disenfranchised.

At few times in American history have college students been as impotent in influencing institutional policies as they have been in the past decade. Since the mid-1950's, most colleges and all universities have been in a seller's market: students could either buy the available commodity at the going rates or suffer the consequences. Hence students have lost the bargaining power their predecessors once possessed because the institutions are no longer dependent on their patronage: other youngsters are waiting for admission if disaffected students drop out. Many students have thus not only felt forced by necessity to attend college, but forced by the faculty to follow prescribed programs of study, and forced by the size of the institutions to play an insignificant role in its decisions. Yet they have found redress of their grievances to be difficult if not impossible: their concerns have tended to be dismissed or rejected. Moreover, they have seen evidence outside the universities of the long-term trend in society toward greater democracy -- a trend evident around the world in peoples' expectations that they should participate in their own governance -- and a trend evident in students' own homes where the family structure has been shifting from patriarchal authority toward equalitarianism; but they have witnessed little of this trend within the university itself.

5. The students and the culture have changed.

The students of the late 1960's reflect the changes of their society. Most of them are more affluent, more cosmopolitan, more knowledgeable, more questioning, than those of even a decade ago. They are more oriented toward causes than mere careers: many have no interest in joining the conventional middle class that they know, and have no desire to be influenced by institutions that they believe to be organized primarily for occupational indoctrination. Their social concern, idealism, and humanitarianism have not been satisfied by the curriculum, and many have come to the radical belief that America can only be reformed through revolution rather than amelioration. To them, our society's weaknesses of inequity seem too persistent, its sources of power too corrupt, its educational institutions too tainted to be corrected.

To these students, if the college and university will not be the conscience of the society, then they themselves will be. "The time for discussion is over," some claim, demanding that the university become political by taking institutional positions on public issues rather than limiting itself to the role of an analyst of issues and a forum for their debate. The more morally arrogant students are hence adopting the tactics of obstructionism and confrontation to reshape the universities and use them for their own ends.

In short, it has been the students who have forced us to ask whether our current patterns of academic government are adequate in light of the trends of the past decade -- the rapid expansion of higher education, the increased financial commitments of universities to government and business, the rise of faculty power, and the concomitant decline of administrative

and student influence. And from the evidence of the colloquium, it seems clear that all is not well with academic government.

Most of the members of the colloquium agreed that broadened participation was necessary in institutional decisions and that serious problems exist in university financing, in curricular planning, in institutional efficiency, and in adjudicating differences of opinion about institutional purposes and roles. More colleges and universities than might be expected, it appears, must yet make good their professed ideals by assuring opportunities for the participation of all interested members in policy formation, by insuring the rights of their members to the safeguards of due process, and by truly becoming what they can be: models for society of organizational government. And some institutions will need to do more than transform their principles into practice: they will find it necessary to adopt new principles adequate for the times and to experiment with models of government that assure the participation of all their members.

Beyond these structural changes that appear necessary, the colloquium made clear that at least part of the current conflict over academic government stems less from substantive differences than from confusion and ignorance. Some of the rhetoric of academic life -- such as "institutional autonomy" and "academic community" -- proved under examination to be more valuable for polemic than for understanding. And some of the advocates of change -- such as those calling for an inner-directed university governed only by academics in order for the university to be an "independent" influence on society -- appear to want to restructure the university to achieve goals that are already being implemented, or reorganize it in ways that would negate the very goals they espouse. Thus the colloquium

demonstrated both that the problems of academic government have not been adequately analyzed and also that the information which does exist on these problems from scholars in the several disciplines is by and large unknown both to faculty members and to students.

These two problems of inadequate research and insufficient understanding are so serious for the explication and resolution of differences of opinion about academic government that they form the focus of the recommendations stemming from the colloquium.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although higher education has at last come to be a respectable area of analysis for sociologists and political scientists as well as for psychologists, few scholars other than Berdahl, Chambers, or Cowley even yet devote their primary attention to the analysis of academic government. Since more systematic knowledge of academic organization and operations is urgently required, some way must be found to engage more scholars from other disciplines cooperatively in this effort. Issues such as the following deserve analysis by specialists from one or another discipline:

> How are resources and rewards now allocated in a variety of institutions. Who from outside the institution and from within is involved in the decisions?
>
> What patterns of state regulation have evolved among the states, and what is the legal status of state visitation in them? What are the consequences of state visitation and of other external supervision and of active surveillance by governing boards?
>
> What are the effects of the constitutional status of public higher education in the several states with this pattern of legal mandate? And what have been the consequences of constitutional changes in such a state as Michigan?

> What are the effects of faculty participation on governing boards at the few institutions operating on this system? And what are the effects of "community government" at those institutions which have adopted this pattern of operation? Similarly, what are the effects of faculty "collegiality" and the several new models of student involvement in academic government now being developed?

In these analyses, case studies of academic institutions as social and behavioral systems must be undertaken, either on an interdisciplinary basis or by researchers in higher education in cooperation with scholars from other fields.

In addition, case studies will be needed of the crises that will be occurring in the next several years in the wake of Berkeley and Columbia. Both of these events have been the subject of detailed study already; but for institutions unable to conduct their own reviews of such events, a group of researchers--possibly from several institutions across the country -- should be prepared to be called on short notice to examine the substance and process of these incidents. Here, again, an interdisciplinary approach with scholars from several fields is needed.

Beyond these immediate research needs, the field of higher education scholarship requires better data, better recruits, and better communication. With regard to needed data, although attention has begun to be turned to the financial plight of the nation's colleges and universities, these analyses are hindered by the continuing lack of standardized and comparable fiscal information on institutions. A data bank with such information, developed either through the United States Office of Education, the American Council on Education, or other organizations, could be of great benefit for research and planning, particularly if scholars from several fields were involved in its design.

Concerning recruits and communication, a few universities such as Columbia are already equipped to prepare a select number of students for careers in higher education research -- as specialists either in institutional research or at state and national levels -- but they need additional support to strengthen these programs and to provide post-doctoral aid to scholars from other disciplines who are interested in higher education research. In addition, although the study of higher education will eventually become institutionalized with its own organization, in the meantime some financial support is desirable for a modest newsletter to be circulated by some agency, such as the Center for Research and Development at Berkeley, The American Council on Education, or the Institute of Higher Education at Teachers College, among researchers in higher education to enable them to develop and coordinate their studies more systematically.

Next, the information already available about academic government must be more broadly disseminated from researchers to the public and to academicians as well. Here such organizations as the Association of Governing Boards, the American Council on Education, and the National Student Association are attempting to educate their respective constituencies; but paradoxically the greatest ignorance seems evident among the professoriate itself. Attempts to interest faculty members in institutional problems beyond their own disciplinary concerns have tended in the past to be notoriously unsuccessful, but educational efforts remain needed here. Some evidence from the colloquium indicated that in the future, after a few more years of confrontation between students and administrators over students rights outside the classroom, the curriculum

is likely to become the major battleground, with student confronting the faculty rather than the administration about course offerings, degree requirements, and grading. These future encounters may be even less likely of resolution than the present difficulties unless both faculty members and students soon gain widened perspectives on issues of university goverance -- possibly through institutional colloquia such as the present one or workshops on an inter-institutional or regional basis.

Finally, nothing in the colloquium appeared to deny the evidence that the role of academic administrator -- despite its denegration by most professors and many students -- remains critical in the process of academic governance. The president and his associates are at the nexus of relationships within the institution; their functions are among the most complex and ambiguous on campus; and the success of their role affects all elements of the organization. The administrator must therefore receive the best preparation possible for his tasks. It is most unlikely, however, that more than a small minority of new college and university presidents will in the foreseeable future receive formal preparation in higher education as a field of study. Indeed, questions exist as to the desirability of many degree programs for college administrators such as those offered at Teachers College, the University of Michigan, Stanford, and several other institutions. But regardless of the adequacy of these degree programs, one or more of these centers of research in higher education should assume the responsibility for providing <u>post-appointment study</u> for new administrators. Such programs might be three months in length, in contrast to the two weeks of training currently offered by the American Council on Education Institute for College and University

Administrators. They should be staffed by experts from throughout the university, and should cover most of the issues -- fiscal, legal, governmental, structural, emotional -- likely to be faced by the incoming administrator. No other single activity is so likely to increase the effectiveness of new presidents and thereby mitigate many of the problems raised in the colloquium as this.

In sum, the summer colloquium at Teachers College has tried to identify the major issues underlying the current difficulties in academic government. It has already begun to have some impact on Columbia University itself, and the ideas presented at its sessions should have broad impact as they are distributed to interested individuals across the country in the near future. As a result of the colloquium, the staff of the Department of Higher and Adult Education are expanding their concept of the role that they should play in helping solve these problems. Thus for all involved, the colloquium proved a fruitful opportunity to assess our condition and inaugurate improvements.

SUMMARIES OF THE GENERAL SESSIONS

The following summaries were prepared initially by the four full-time research assistants assigned to the central office of the Colloquium: Gordon Darkenwald, Ronald Getty, Cheryl Opacinch, and Ernest Sobel. Each of them assumed responsibility for summarizing the main points of a presentation and the ensuing discussion. The drafts of their summaries were distributed to the other research assistants to ensure that an accurate synthesis of the session resulted. These summaries, however, have not been read or approved by the speakers themselves.

Speaker	Page
Walter P. Metzger	22
David Riesman	25
Franklin Littel	29
Charles DeCarlo	32
Alan Westin	35
Harold Noah	38
David Levey	40
Clark Byse	44
W. H. Cowley	46
Edward Schwartz	49
Carl Davidson	52

The Effects of Delocalism on Academic Freedom and Governance

Walter P. Metzger
Professor of History, Columbia University

From Professor Metzger's perspective, the most serious problem confronting American universities and their governance is the fact that during the past half century they have been remodeled while the ideas once consonant with them -- such as that of academic freedom -- have not changed. "The theory of academic freedom that has been articulated in this country has, in critical respects, become outmoded," he argues. This theory, enunciated in 1915 with the founding of the AAUP, continues to speak only of an individual academic's interest without acknowledging the existence of a corporate academic interest of the university at large -- but this corporate academic interest is now in jeopardy because of the growth of social forces that Professor Metzger labels "delocalism."

> By the lights of 1915, a violation of academic freedom was a crime designed and executed within the confines of the university. Dissident professors were the victims; trustees and administrators were the culprits. The power of dismissal was the weapon; the loss of employment was the wound. Concentrating on this stage and scenario, the authors of the 1915 statement concluded that the key to crime prevention lay in the adoption of regulations that would heighten the security of the office-holder and temper the arbitrariness of the boss. So persuaded, they persuaded others, and in time these institutional regulations known as academic tenure and due process came to be widely popular, if not always faultlessly applied.
>
> It should be noted, however, that by defining a violation of academic freedom as something that happens <u>in</u> a university rather than something that happens <u>to</u> a university, these writers ignored a set of issues that caused their foreign counterparts much concern. Nothing was said in this document about the relations of the academy to the state; about the difficulties of the spiritual authority in the face of the steady aggrandisement of the temporal authority .... Nothing was said in this document about threats to the autonomy of the university that were not at one and the same time threats to the livelihood of its members. In fact, it wasn't even clearly acknowledged that a corporate academic

> interest, as distinct from an individual academic's interest existed at all so as to be preserved. In short, 1915's criminology -- and a criminology lived by today, if you take the policing efforts of Committee A as a model -- was wise to the ways of the harsh employer, but it lacked a theory and vocabulary for dealing with the outside effect and the nonoccupational offense.

For its time, the 1915 theory was adequate: university neutrality by disownment was the rule, college had a uniformly discrete organization, a researcher was by definition also a teacher, state legislatures had not assumed regulatory functions, private colleges with their narrower constituencies comprised the bulk of academic institutions, and the federal government maintained a negligible interest in education. "Taken more seriously for its fun and frolics than for its earnest devotions, the university of 1915 was regarded as a public ornament or curiosity, not yet as a public utility." And most importantly, the university was still local in its orientation and support.

But times have changed. The structure of the university of 1968 is different: the modern university is richer, larger, more complex, and less self-directed than its predecessor. Its esprit de corps has shifted, as it has watched the decline of professional elan and the growth of secrecy and deceit as parts of the academic way of life. And above all, the modern university is subject to a medley of delocalization pressures that are destroying the quiet provincialism of the past: (1) The central city is engulfing many universities and is affecting their decisions about land use. (2) Bureaucraticized philanthropy has become the principle source of academic innovation. (3) The judgment of admissions officers is being subordinated to a host of legislative judgments. (4) Universities are increasingly involved in social welfare and thus with clients that they serve but do

not control.(5) Public higher education is being systematized and increasingly coordinated by the states. (6) The principle of university extraterritoriality has been assaulted. And (7) federal influence has burgeoned due to federal sponsorship of research. In short, Metzger contends that the history of the past half century demonstrates that the acquisition of social significance and relevance by American universities has dissipated their autonomy.

How can the forces of delocalism be controlled? Among the suggestions that Metzger offers are these: Universities must make a fundamental distinction between essentially political questions on the one hand and essentially educational questions that have political implications, and they must take a stand only on the latter types of questions. State systems of public higher education should be broken into regional subgroups. A national educational opportunity bank should be initiated. The British system of giving lump-sum grants to institutions rather than grants for specific projects should be adopted. And an enlarged theory of academic freedom must be developed that will encompass crimes against the academic independence of universities as institutions as well as against academics as individuals.

Questions Concerning the Issues

David Riesman
Henry Ford II Professor of the Social Sciences
Harvard University

Professor Riesman considered three questions in his discussion of academic governance. First, what accounts for the differences among institutions of higher education that are supposedly in the same league? Second, what are the alliances and coalitions that are developing among the quartet of groups on the university campus -- the trustee-administrator group, the faculty, the students, and the community group? And third, is there a career line for administrators in higher education?

To the first issue of institutional differences, Professor Riesman noted that he was "very much impressed with the enormous differences between Mount Holyoke and Smith in every conceivable way, or among Boston College, Fordham, Marquette, the University of Detroit and the University of Seattle." Even Harvard, Columbia, Princeton and the University of Chicago are in reality very different institutions. Part of the difference lies in their formal structure, such as whether the students and faculty live close enough together -- seeing one another in the bookstores and the local variants of the greasy spoon -- to develop a community. Part stems from differences in their intellectual style -- vibrant and abrasive versus guarded and somnolent -- and the types of students they attract and select -- only brilliant youngsters with more than 700 on the SATs versus intellectually and social heterogeneous students, including both future museum curators and yachtsmen. But part stems also from their differences in manage-

ment, where assistant professors at some institutions may participate in the election of department chairmen, and from the role of trustees in institutional affairs.

Concerning the role of the trustees, he recalled:

> I remember once going to a meeting of trustees of a small New England liberal arts college. I wasn't a trustee, but I was one of their academic advisors. As we were breaking for lunch and the eagerly desired sherry, the new president -- a young man -- said,"Oh, by the way," and threw on the table the drawings for a new dormitory. The plans had been approved by the buildings and grounds committee of the trustees, but no one else in the room had seen them. I picked them up and saw that they were in Howard Johnson Georgian style. People were starting to move out to the dining room but I said, "Hey, wait a minute! Something awful is happening here. Are we telling our students that our imagination is so penurious that we cannot think of any visual aesthetic other than this pastiche?" The president was very angry with me at first. He felt that this was something he could leave to his trustees -- in order to keep them out of faculty appointments and important matters -- and he thought that they'd like Howard Johnson. The fact is, he greatly underestimated them. I was very much delighted with one old Vermont banker who said, "We don't even build bank buildings as bad as that anymore." The result of my intervention had a happy ending because they all agreed to throw it back to the architect, and now they have buildings of which they're quite proud. The architect had designed it because he thought Howard Johnson was what was wanted; the president had gone along because he felt that what's what was wanted, and everybody on the faculty had resigned themselves to it. But it was, it seemed to me, an educational decision and not one that could just go through the buildings and grounds committee....The problem is to find what decisions that are not involved with education to throw to trustees.

Riesman doubts that an "academic community" can exist and that instead a series of shifting coalitions is occurring among the groups that comprise the university. At the moment, attempts at coalition are developing between the administrators and students against the faculty, and the faculty and trustees against the administrator.

He notes, however:

> I have yet to see a movement of student protest anywhere in the United States which has not had partial legitimation from dissident faculty. Without faculty legitimation it seems to me that these movements almost never succeed.... And wherever the administration loses the support of the faculty, it's finished.

Commenting on the curricular changes that are underway, Riesman states:

> Students and many faculty underestimate the quite considerable malleability of even the backward industry in which we are engaged.... My guess is that in terms of responding to curiosities of students -- bright students, able students -- the university has come a long way.... The place where it seems the universities have done the least adequate job is in moving students who are not motivated, who are not sophisticated, who have never had an experience of academic success in their previous schooling -- but who now come, nevertheless, to college. In dealing with these students by starting in the course in English with "Paradise Lost" or Spenser's "Faerie Queen" doesn't seem to me optimal. It seems to me more imaginative and more difficult to begin with something to which the students would be more ready to respond and then to move them to Shakespeare or Dostoyevsky if one had good luck.

He warns that attempts at educational reform may be defeated by the growth of faculty democracy:

> Faculty democracy is a bad omen for someone who is interested in curricular experiment.... When you get a democratic structure in the faculty, you're likely to defeat educational reform so long as you have a preponderance of people whom I'd like to call "home-guard cosmopolitans." A home-guard cosmopolitan is a man who is both attached to his discipline and who cares about his local institution. He has an institutional loyalty which makes him think, "What that fellow Riesman want to do, I'd better stop -- because I care." Faculty democracy here means that the power exists to stop reform.

Turning to the third issue -- that of a career line for administrators, Riesman believes that manpower planning is badly needed in the field of academic administration, and he sees the likelihood of more and more administrators being recruited from among scientists.

> It's ironical, but there's no career line leading into administrative work, unless you're a student at Teachers College or a few other institutions. There's no training for most administrators except the training of having been a scholar, which has, I think, a profound negative effect on many.

> I've seen some pretty good administrators who are fairly young and energetic ex-scientists -- who've decided they weren't going to pursue a career of greatness in research. In the natural sciences, the half-life of a productive scholar is sometimes very short. You know already at the age of 25 whether you're good or not. But in the humanities and in the social sciences, from which most administrators still come, people continue even at the age of 60 to hope that someday they can write something important. Too often, once they enter administration, they continue to compete with their faculty in their area of scholarship.
>
> One of the reasons I like natural scientists is that they are less prone to the feeling of almost masochistic self-distrust -- a kind of malice, a feeling that "somebody else is getting ahead of me" -- than we are in the social sciences and in the humanities. A man who has written a book in the humanities often worries, "Can I do it again?" A man who's working in the natural sciences doesn't have that worry: he's part of a more collective and incremental operation.

Riesman notes that businessmen, like scientists,"have less of those qualities of mistrust and human malignity than intellectuals are prone to." Thus he concludes, "You see why I don't want to turn management of affairs over to people like me. I just don't feel that they would be that much more humane."

The Students' Stake in Academic Governance

Franklin Littell
President, Iowa Wesleyan University

President Littell etches a gloomy canvass of American higher education. He senses that the alienation and frustration of students has been growing for decades, primarily due to three factors.

First, according to the evidence of several recent studies, "college students today are older biologically, physiologically and more mature in many respects than students of 30 years ago, and certainly 60 years ago." Since most of our procedures in higher education were developed in the period from 1890 to 1910, they have become increasingly obsolete as a result.

Second, with the arrival of the Age of Spock, a distinct discrepancy has arisen between the democratic style of life in the family and the authoritarian style of life in the high school. The college, offering few channels of communication, is placed in a difficult position. Students "are resentful of administration. It takes at least a year of good work....to convince them that any administration is honest."

Third, a widespread massing process exists due to the increase in student numbers and the lack of necessary planning.

When these factors are coupled together, the students are learning that to get a hearing, it is necessary to adopt extra-procedural mechanisms. Littell warns:

> I believe that it's utter hypocrisy for an institution to claim to represent civic virtue and to claim to impart self-government in republican principle and then practice police-state tactics. But it's very widely done.

> I am generalizing from conversations with other administrators, and not just from my own experience. I think that we are making revolutionaries--that is, persons who have learned that the only way to get a hearing is to adopt extra-procedural measures and who go on to develop the ideology and practical discipline implicit in it. This may be a good thing, but we should be aware of what we are doing. It takes more than the reading of books in American government and American history to convince youths that the system can be made to work--that our constitution or the due process are viable. It takes a great deal more than that particularly if they aren't experiencing them. If we are making revolutionaries, we are building for a radically changed society.

Littell accuses American universities of creating excellent graduate programs by cheating undergraduates. The problems of "massing" and of graduate students acting as faculty for undergraduates have aided in generating the current alienation, frustration and resentment.

> ...What we are doing in much of our so-called higher education at the present time is producing technically competent barbarians and short-circuiting--indeed cutting out--the whole pursuit of wisdom. Wisdom has to do with the oral tradition, with the thoughts that loom from behind, with memory recapitulation, reenactment for the transmissions of culture, and the appropriation of one's heritage for the achievement of one's self-identity.
>
> This cannot be done in an assembly line. It can only be done in a creative way through dialogue which transcends generations, which is supposed to be the business of the classic academy and of the modern university, which in large measure, has simply given up. We're engaged in producing what the market requires: persons who are technically competent, but who may have had no genuine experience of creative unity... in the process of being trained.

What President Littell espouses in university governance is basically a more humanistic and democratic approach. To humanize the university and to curtail the massing process, he strongly urges that large institutions be broken up into smaller units, as is occurring at Michigan State University and elsewhere. Two-generational interaction must be obtained by promoting student contact with faculty and administrators. Integral goals of higher education that should be

promoted include an importance of style in life, public commitment, and "soul." The administrators and faculty should not only advocate these ideals through official actions in their institutions, but also set an example on a more personal, private basis through their own demeanor and attitudes.

Littell feels that since students are inheritors of society, they should have a model of the university that is democratic. The trustees are an obstacle to creating such a model, however, because they apply to the university the style of thinking which they have as directors of corporations:

> That is, they have employees--the faculty--and they turn out a known product which is in demand--the students. This is the reason why the tendency of trustees, unless they remember who they are and what they're there for, is to think in a manipulative way ....

Plans to provide a broader democratic base of power through "detrusteeization" should include a system of checks and balances involving trustees, administrators, faculty, students and alumni. These plans should encourage student participation in the governance of the institution, as opposed to "student government" as in the past. In this way, Littell believes, institutions will be capable of regaining integrity, liberty and dignity.

> The university must be a major center of social change, it must function as the conscience of society; it must resist totalitarianism, whether it comes from an ideological state, or simply a government which has forgotten its proper function.

The Necessity for the System to Overthrow Itself

Charles De Carlo
Director of Automation Research
International Business Machines Corporation

Dr. De Carlo contends that education should be a socialization, not a certification process. "What we need, given our enormous technical virtuosity," he suggests, "is a society in which people are selves, where people can begin to distinguish the ends and the means, the purposes and the acts. And this does not come out of studying engineering."

De Carlo notes that the technological advances of recent decades have resulted in an economy of unprecedented and relatively stable abundance. With economic insecurity virtually eliminated, the quality of life is displacing work as the central concern of man. While meaning was once found almost exclusively in work, now that machines can do most of the work, individuals must look for meaning within themselves. It is the task of the educational system to facilitate this process of self-realization: thus universal liberal education is not a luxury but a necessity if the quality of individual and social life is to be enhanced. And hence De Carlo envisions a curriculum from grade school through the university which is concerned exclusively with beauty and truth, with taste rather than technique, with the liberal arts instead of job-oriented practical training. The university should be "the agency for the transmission of the ongoing culture and the agent for making that culture mean something in terms of the past and projecting into the future."

If the university exists to promote individual growth through

intellectual and aesthetic pursuits, then how should it be reorganized to facilitate these ends? De Carlo advocates the overthrow of the existing system: "I would make an absolute separation in higher education of the vocational and professional act from the act of socialization, of liberal education.... Graduate and professional schools should be completely detached from the educational process and made part of the non-profit or profit corporate entity devoted to research." These specialized schools, then, would award the appropriate certificates attesting to some kind of vocational competency, while the university would concern itself solely with liberal education.

> I have a feeling that to the extent something is practical, it should not be taught in school. I have seen in my own experience that the large technical institutions of society can ingest good people and train them themselves. And they don't need four years to do it. I've been responsible for engineering where we took engineers from every conceivable kind of school, and the first thing we did was spend six months on retraining their bad laboratory technique. If we look realistically we would put the burden of professional and technical training on those institutions in society which are concerned with professional and technical work. The enormous gain that you would get immediately in the quality of education is self-evident. And I would contend that in terms of teaching practical things in physics, IBM and General Electric or RCA will outstrip any physics or engineering department in the country.

To make these changes, De Carlo suggests that reforms must first be made in university trusteeship.

> ...the trustees have to play a new role. First of all, we've got to get rid of the self-perpetuating trusteeship in all institutions -- in business as well as universities -- so that there is some guarantee that periodically the trustees actually are subjected to a complete turnover. I'd like to see the state play a much larger role in monitoring the appointment and election of trustees to guarantee this turnover. And we should expand the trusteeship to include professional members of the staff so there will be some faculty representation and probably some kind of alumni representation.

Finally, the actual role of the trustees will continue to be the practical matter of funding, but I think trustees should be trained and forced to make an annual or semiannual evaluation of their institution to articulate the goals of the institution and to measure the institution in terms of whether it's accomplishing them.

Changing Concepts of Student Citizenship in the Contemporary University

Alan Westin
Professor of Public Law and Government, Columbia University

> We've reached an era in which much of the fundamental work in social science in the past twenty to thirty years is beginning to bear political fruit in society. Today, the basic language is the language of political realism--of process, of power, of the decision-making pattern as it is--not of formal institutions and legal systems. I think this means a very important thing: the old smoothing-out processes of facade and graciousness and suaveness are being replaced by terribly accurate and realistic perceptions about community power structure, about the way decisions are really made, about false participation and real participation, about due process in form and substance. This means that a great deal of the kind of managerial governance that you had in more formal eras is simply not going to be accepted now.

For these reasons, Professor Westin suggests that student citizenship now must contain two vital components: participation and due process. Westin views participation as "a process of sharing information, of providing structures for debate and discussion, and for relying on various modes or procedures for securing its assets from those persons who are part of an institution and whose rights and interests will be affected by decisions which that institution makes." Due process has three elements: pre-defined rules of behavior, fair hearing procedures, and an impartial system of review and appeal within the institution.

Professor Westin asserts that "we are witnessing in the United States today...an increasing demand for participation in due process in both the public and the private systems in the nation." This "constitutionalizing" of the public and the private structures has both political and psychological origins. Politically, it originates from the demands of the poor and the black and the students in the American

political system for a meaningful role in formulating the decisions which affect them, and from the seemingly irreversible trend towards largeness and conglomeration and the accompanying hierarchial unresponsiveness in urban America. Psychologically, in America today, Westin believes, "there is a search for openness among people, for contact -- an intimacy which is a very severe challenge to the model of impersonality and distance on which so much of faculty-student and administration-faculty relations has classically been based."

Westin argues that both the university and society at large "must return scale to a sense of participation directly by people, otherwise there is no hope for significant change in the system." Many of the private structures of society — corporations, unions, churches, civic groups -- are already responding to the new urgings for participation and due process. Within the university these issues of student citizenship lead Westin to the following suggestions: Regarding participation of students, the entire range of university planning and overall direction must be made a participative function of the whole university community. This includes such priority decisions as the nature of university expansion, definition of the university community itself, the selection of new members, the choice of fund-raising philosophy, the structure and the process of education and the role of the university in the larger community.

Turning to the component of due process in student citizenship, Westin proposes providing students with the option of selecting one of two due process procedures -- either the friendly dean or an adversary procedure -- with an appeal system built into both.

> ...a good warm chat with the dean...has a certain kind of informality and intimacy which is a very good way of dealing with certain situations. I wouldn't want to see every student who threw a rock through a window hire Edward Bennett Williams and set up a televised -- or non-televised -- proceeding of due process. But I think that there are many issues of discipline in the university which call for a legal and formal body -- issues which involve fundamental dissent from the rules of the university.... If you respect diversity and individuality in a university, why not let the student have the option of which mechanism he chooses in terms of which he thinks is in his best interest? As long as justice is going to be done in either case with an appeal, it seems to me it has advantages to have both models in the universities.

Finally, Westin offers two principles that provide an ideal way to approach participation in any system, political or private: (1) an institution needs to provide certain basic experiences and knowledge for its members so that their decisions can be informed and meaningful, and (2) an institution must provide for alternate structures and processes since all members are not alike. For the university, these mean that all students need a core of experience about the operations of the university -- but that all students must not be regimented as members of the university.

To the faculty, Westin recalls:

> Plato suggested that when the affairs of the state got very uproarious and dangerous, sometimes the philosopher had to go inside the academy to let the dust storm pass. Only then might he sortie out and be useful again in society. My own sense is that if the philosophers of today are to be effective in society, perhaps they should look to the remaking of the academy and, with this, hope to affect the society outside.

The Economics of Higher Education

"Economic Aspects of Size and Growth in Higher Education"

Harold Noah
Associate Professor of Economics and Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Professor Noah asserts that the university's economic problems have been exacerbated by their rapid growth of recent years. "Technically backward in an economic milieu which is technologically highly progressive," the university finds it increasingly difficult to compete with government and industry because in an era of rising costs it has not found ways to make its personnel more productive or its procedures more efficient.

> I am talking to you in much the same way as Thomas Aquinas taught. Over a period of seven hundred years we haven't moved off this kind of situation of one man talking to a group. The expansion of higher education has not come because somebody has managed to wave some tremendous technological wand and managed to educate lots more people by consuming very little in the way of increased resources. We've done it instead in a paleolithic way of simply doing more of what we've been accustomed to doing.

In considering the financial support of higher education, Noah observes that private philanthropy has not been able to keep up with the increasing demand for funds, accounting for only 1.6 of the twenty billion dollars now expended annually for higher education. In contrast, the states and federal government contribute half of this twenty billion. And with this money, power has followed. Universities have entered the maelstrom of American life as "clients and suppliers for the state". The inputs of the university "are paid for largely by government funds and are structured therefore in ways

which meet with general state, federal, and local approval. Their outputs are largely destined to serve the society which supports them." And as a consequence, "any attempt to use universities ... somehow to change the whole structure of society is not likely to go very far".

One way to reduce the influence on educational policy of government agencies and the corporate economy is by greater financial support from individual students. Noah believes that students should bear the principal cost,"since there is a lot to be said for the point of charging students the full value of the returns which they will capture in later life as a result of their higher education." He predicts that low cost long-term loans will become increasingly attractive to both students and institutions of higher learning.

Although he expressed doubt about the viability of schemes to use the university to change the whole structure of society, Noah is troubled because the university does not seem to be very innovative within the social structure. "Universities ought to be the place", he proposes, "where we try out varieties of social innovations."

> One would expect from some economic first principles that the larger an industry becomes, the less it is pushed right up against the limits of competition. It has more room; it's not living on the verge of bankruptcy. And thus the larger it becomes, the more innovative it can become. It can afford to invest capital and lose capital in experiments that don't turn out right. It can afford to take a long-term view and wait for the payoff from experimental programs.
>
> One might have thought that universities, as they have grown larger, would become more adventurous in this business of social innovation. They ought, with their size and relative sense of security about the future, to be adventuresome, daring, even revolutionary in their innovations. But I would suggest that this hasn't happened. On the contrary

> they are timid and unable to come to grips with the real problems in a societal and economic situation that certainly requires imaginative thinking and doing. And one reason I would submit for this timidity is the awful institution of tenure of professors, which reinforces whatever conservative and traditionalist tendencies there are already in higher education.

"The University as a Business Firm"

David Levey
Assistant Professor of Economics, Yale University

Professor Levey presents a carefully developed model of the university as a microcosm of the capitalist system -- "a model of the way the university is perceived by those students who are the most vociferous and the most radical in their demands for change." He indicates that he is in substantial agreement with the radical students in their economic perceptions of the university.

Student restiveness, according to Levey, is a result not simply of the rapid growth of higher education which Professor Noah mentioned, but of a change in students' perception of the university itself.

> The university is strung out between two contradictory models of itself: the model of itself as a place of learning in which the students and faculty come together in a mutually beneficial relationship in which human knowledge is to be passed on from one to another; and the model of the university as a part of the corporate economy, as a segment of the economy with certain outputs which are essential to the continued functioning of that economy.

It is the tension between these two models coexisting in the minds of students which gives rise to frustration and, in some instances, to violence.

To demonstrate the significance of the second model, Levey describes three ways in which the outputs of the university serve the national corporate economy in which the corporate economy in turn determines what the university's outputs shall be. The most important output of the university is skilled manpower. Since it is not the university but the corporate economy which decides which skills are important at any given time, it is the corporate economy and not the university which decides which schools, departments, and programs will or will not be emphasized. In short, the economy decides educational policy. As examples, Levey cites the emphasis during the past decade on the physical sciences for the purpose of bolstering the defense system and the current stress on the social sciences as a panacea for social disequilibrium. He notes that the major growth universities are those which most assiduously pander to the research desires of the corporate economy and the government and whose budgets are largely supported by the military-industrial establishment.

If the university's first output is skilled manpower for the corporate system, its second major output or function is to provide an ideology for that system: ideology not in the narrow sense of propaganda, but ideology in the very broad sense of rationalizations, justifications, and explanations of the structure of society.

> It is the particular function of the intellectuals to prepare ideology. This can, of course, be either defensive or revolutionary. It is certainly the academic intellectuals

> who have presented society with the kinds of self-images which it possesses, and these self-images are of tremendous importance in determining people's behaviors.

Levey sees the growth of social science research in recent years as evidence that the society wants information on how its crises can be resolved without leading to a revolutionary upheaval. "It is the function of the intellectuals to the extent that they are not themselves revolutionaries to provide the society with knowledge as to how to manage its problems."

The third way that the university contributes to the corporate economy is by going directly into the process of production itself in areas where the corporate economy deems this useful. Levey cites the satellite industrial park at Stanford and the NASA center near MIT as examples.

Levey states that the corporate economy maintains direct control over the universities through domination of their boards of trustees. Not only do the corporations and the government exercise direct control through governing boards, but their research contracts determine which fields receive support and for what purposes. Thus, the direction of scholarly and educational activity is almost completely determined by the corporate economy.

In rounding out his model of the university as a microcosm of the capitalist system, Levey compares the position of students to that of the industrial proletariat. He notes that workers who demand higher wages are told that in so doing they will only hurt themselves through loss of markets and rising living costs. In like manner, protesting students are told that their actions will only hurt the university,

discourage alumni giving, and jeopardize adoption of budgets by legislative bodies. "In any system organized according to capitalist modes of production, the workers are boxed in," he contends. The university itself is not completely a prisoner, however. "There is still room for maneuver within the bounds of the university. There is still room for university reform." But he warns that if "conservatism prevails and no attempts are made by the university to increase its autonomy to the satisfaction of the students, then the end result will be simply to aggravate the response of the students."

The University and Due Process: A Somewhat Different View

Clark Byse
Professor of Law, Harvard University

The view of the university and due process expounded by Professor Byse is "somewhat different" from that of President James A. Perkins of Cornell, who in a recent address on "The University and Due Process" characterized the current trend of judicial review and of court concern for due process as a threat to academic freedom -- particularly with respect to the ability of institutions to make "qualitative decisions about human talent." President Perkins had argued that this trend will result in "every aspect of academic affairs being open to legal challenge in which the university would spend its lifetime on the witness stand, in which quite simply, civil jurisdiction over intellectual inquiry would be complete."

Byse disagrees. In his view, due process is not a "legal octopus about to strangle the academic community with its tentacles of insensitivity, conflict, obtuseness, technicality, wrangling, inflexibility, expense and delay." On the contrary, "the process which the constitution requires is only that process which is due in light of the circumstances and interests of the parties involved. Rather than requiring colleges and universities to 'wrangle over technicalities,' the demand of due process is only that there be fair play."

Far from condemning the courts as being too obtrusive, Byse regrets the fact that "there is no assurance that the courts will continue the wholesome development thus begun." He notes that so far the courts have limited the requirement of due process to state institutions, because the Fourteenth Amendment limits state rather than private action,

but he predicts that private institutions will eventually be subject to the same standards under state courts and state laws.

Byse does concede that review by the courts has certain dangers to the university. In addition to the obvious costs of judicial review cited by Perkins, he cites three potentially serious threats: (1) a pervasive system of judicial review could deter academic decision-makers from exercising their independent judgments for fear of justifying them in court; (2) such a system could lead to the abdication of responsibility by administrators who conclude that the courts will make the final decisions anyway; and (3) court interference may shift the "focus of inquiry from that which is desirable or wise to that which is constitutional or legal."

Thus he cautions against too much reliance on the courts, noting that judicial review should be resorted to only after all intramural efforts to resolve a dispute have failed; and he calls for mechanisms within the university to provide for academic due process so that recourse to the courts will be necessary only in exceptional cases.

Despite these dangers, Byse unequivocally advocates judicial vindication of basic student interests when circumstances warrant it. He sees due process as an alternative to violence as a means of achieving student goals: "Far better . . . for students to be encouraged to utilize the orderly processes of the courts than to strike, to sit in, or to engage in other confrontations."

Academic Government: Participants and Structures

W.H. Cowley
David Jacks Professor of Higher Education, emeritus, Stanford University

W. H. Cowley claims that every institution of higher learning is a government that is influenced by at least nine interest groups: the civil government or state, the trustees or agents of civil government, the administration, the various faculties, the students, the alumni, the learned societies, the protective societies, and the general public.

Cowley argues that all of these interest groups have a basic right to participate in the governance of the university. Of all nine, he claims that the learned societies are the most powerful today and that they control the intellectual destiny of American higher education:

> ...the American Chemical Society, the American Psychological Association, etc., these in the last analysis determine who gets raises in salary, and who get raises in rank. Their standards control the electorial standards of the institutions. Professors look to the peer group within the learned society rather than their peers in their institution for rewards, and the way to get recognition by your peer group in the learned society is by means of research papers.... If you're a political scientist and you don't have the recognition as a political scientist with other political scientists, then you're no one as a political scientist. And if you seek to move to a higher job, and you don't have the approval of those within the learned society, you're going to stay right where you are.

To Cowley, three major problems now face academic government: ill will, misunderstanding, and lack of coordination.

> I think the first problem is how do we get back good will among the groups who are legal participants in the government of American higher education: the recognition that we all have rights and that in good will we can sit down and talk as honorable men and women who are concerned with what is in my judgment the most hopeful institution in the modern world -- the American college and university.

> Second is the problem of understanding. This is a problem of education. I'm appalled at the ignorance of trustees of just the business aspect of colleges. I'm appalled at faculty ignorance: most faculty members don't know anything about the background of the institutions in which they live. Even administrators know little when they take office.... And we have to develop better understanding among alumni and among students.
>
> Third, how do we coordinate these nine groups? This is the structural problem: how do we, for instance, structure student participation and coordinate it with the participation of the other groups?

Cowley offers three devices he feels will be helpful in solving these problems. The first and most concrete is post-appointment training for administrators and trustees. He would establish workshops for all newly-appointed administrators -- especially the president -- where they could study the nature of higher education, its present status and problems, and its needs. Such workshops could also serve as refresher courses for administrators at various stages in their careers to be brought up to date and examine new trends.

Regarding student participation, he suggests that some institutions consider adopting the Scottish pattern of having students elect an adult representative to the governing board. In addition, students should serve on various institutional committees, and they should themselves study and make recommendations about the institution. He recalls the series of student-initiated reports over the past decades that have stimulated changes at such colleges as Barnard, Dartmouth, and, in particular, Harvard; and advocates similar analyses by today's activists:

> ...this is activism of an intellectual sort: it is saying "This is what's wrong, and this is what should be done." It isn't picketing: it is presenting an intellectually worked-out argument, clearly defended, that is published and distributed, that stands on its own merits -- and that has results.

He believes this technique will serve student purposes better than radical action, since the public will respond more favorably to it.

> ...if students on the left feel they can take over American colleges and universities, they will first have to take over the general public, because the general public in the last analysis will decide on who get elected to the legislatures and thus who decides on budgets. This is inevitable, and I don't see that the American public is likely to accept the formulas of any of the activist groups we have now. The Reagan election in California illustrates the general public reaction to this type of student activism. But I think the public will support students who present their concepts and their criticisms honestly and vigorously and who say "This is wrong."

Third, regarding alumni, he recommends the Harvard system of Overseers:

> Harvard alumni participate in the government of Harvard through the Board of Overseers, who oversee everything, including the other governing board of Harvard -- the Corporation. In addition to that, they send visiting committees regularly throughout the campus to departments and schools. This is one of the most interesting devices that exists, and if you look at the history of Harvard you will see that most of its moves forward have been promoted by these visiting committees....An institution has to stay close to the moving trends of society, and these visiting committees have done this for Harvard. That's why Yale, which doesn't have these visiting committees, has always been thirty years behind Harvard.

In summarizing, he states that "colleges and universities are the focal institutions of modern society the world over....It is tremendously important that we understand how they can be governed honorably and honestly -- because if we fail here, then our society has failed."

Politics and Student Power

Edward Schwartz
President, National Student Association

Mr. Schwartz attributes the growth of student activism in recent years to a general social malaise in America:

> ...things have really moved far beyond the expectations of those of us who said they could and should move. I think they have moved not simply because some of us in this decade raised our voices as to the need for students to begin to concern themselves with affairs beyond their own immediate needs. They have moved not simply because of the events which have affected the entire country in a very traumatic way -- the evolution of the black community and the growing war in Vietnam. They moved because of a growing sense of frustration on the part of the new class of people in this country that the nation has passed through one set of ideological presuppositions about what the American Dream is all about, and has yet to pass into a new one.

Most Americans have achieved the old American Dream, but they have no means of constructing new ideals and new environments in which people can become more human. The reason for this inability lies in cultural limitations and not merely in political weaknesses, he believes; and thus he sees the major difference between the National Student Association and the Students for a Democratic Society as "the degree to which one believes the problems of our country and culture are political problems exclusively, and the degree to which they can be solved exclusively with political rhetoric and ideologies and theories."

> We do not say that the relief or destruction of any particular institution will provide anyone with the solution to the problem of the war or of the ghetto.... The problem is not simply the government or the corporate establishment. The problem is people and culture -- what the culture has come to represent and the limitations it places on our actions: the way it's constructed and the patterns it creates for our thinking. If the problem is our culture, the solution lies in creating new environments so that new cultures can result.

Mr. Schwartz identifies three cultural beliefs -- three "traditional American notions" -- that he believes to be false or inadequate:

1. Individual freedom and equality are mutually supportable goals.

2. Success can be measured by an individual's ability to conquer nature, or, in our increasingly industrialized society, to conquer economic forces and get rich.

3. Conformity -- a common identity, a common ideology, a common spirit -- is good.

"No one of these three principles is adequate for the world we live in," he states. Freedom and equality are in fact mutually exclusive goals; the notion of economic success mitigates a sense of community and a sense of helping; and diversity, rather than conformity, needs to be not only tolerated but encouraged.

Mr. Schwartz thus advocates student power "not simply...to get into a system, but to transform the system in order to bring about changes in the ways various cultural and political institutions are functioning." The university is being challenged primarily because it happens to be the closest of these institutions to the students.

His major recommendation for reorganizing the university is the creation of more experimental colleges within its structure. From his experience at one such experiment during his senior year at Oberlin, Mr. Schwartz believes that they can be a device by which students and faculty can learn how to help one another, to value one another, and to value their own work rather than the standards placed on it by someone else.

> In a sense the experimental college is a small model within a university of what can be within society. It is an attempt to break down the three kinds of ideological presuppositions which I have discussed. In the experimental college environment one does not assume that freedom and equality are mutually supportable goals....

> The whole notion of freedom and equality in the traditional rhetoric goes out the window. People develop a community. They begin to learn how to deal with cultural differences and they begin to learn how to deal with themselves.

The National Student Association will be working for the development of more such colleges, and Mr. Schwartz is optimistic about their potential. For this and other reasons, he says that unlike the Students for a Democratic Society, "I still have not given up the hope that reconstruction in this society is possible. The day I give up hope for reconstruction is the day that I decide the only answer is social revolution. But I haven't yet reached that point."

The Student and the University

Carl Davidson
Regional Officer, Students for a Democratic Society

Mr. Davidson propounds the necessity to reform society before remodeling the university, since his critique of the university involves a critique of American capitalism and imperialism as well. He argues:

> I don't think that it's a good plan to organize students so that they co-manage the affairs of the university -- that we have so many seats in the administration, that we share the administration of the existing university -- because what's happening there is you're building a corporatist movement. You're training students to co-manage an oppresive system with the oppressors. And you're organizing them into the ruling elite rather than against the ruling elite. Not only is it important to organize them against the ruling elite, it's important to organize them with other oppressed groups against capitalistic oppression. We don't want to build a free university in a fascist society.

Thus at the present moment the university is generally a lost cause, since its activities and those of capitalism are completely meshed, what with the industrial and military complex financing university research and its leaders serving as the governing trustees of the university.

This collaboration has corrupted the curriculum and the extracurriculum as well: the student is given certain technical skills and training to be part of a highly technical society, and his extra-curricular activities are merely training exercises for running the social life of a corporate office or engaging in the larger farce of national politics. Students don't have much to look forward to except to apply their technical skills to enriching their companies' coffers.

> They have no productive work to look forward to.... Even if you're planning to be a teacher or a social worker, then you usually learn very quickly that you're some sort of societal flunky -- that the real function of your job in the larger society is to become a hybrid between a glorified babysitter and a cop.